

^c
D44 K
v.1, #1

New Series, Vol. I

FEBRUARY, 1904

Number 1

Published by the University Issued
February, May, August and November

Bulletin
of
DePauw University

Contents : Addresses delivered on Inauguration
Day, December Ninth, Nineteen Hundred Three

ADDRESSES

*Delivered
at the Exercises attending*

The Inauguration of

The Rev. Edwin Holt Hughes, S. T. D.

*as President of
DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana
December 9th, 1903*



School and Nation	- - -	Senator Albert J. Beveridge	Page 2
Charge to the New President	-	President James W. Bashford	Page 10
The Meanings of Christian Education		President Edwin Holt Hughes	Page 14

SCHOOL AND NATION

Address by Senator Albert J. Beveridge.

The glory of all American colleges should be that they produce citizenship as well as culture. And of these, citizenship is more valuable than culture. Culture is important; citizenship is indispensable. Upon the installation of a new president of this institution of learning we naturally turn to the purpose of education in a republic—for the school is the most active influence among our American millions except the influence of the American home. From the council that daily gathers around the American fireside radiate those streams of wisdom and purity which keep the civic life of our country sane and wholesome. But next to the American family, the school is plainly the strongest force molding our destiny. So what the school does is of vital concern to the Nation. The word "school" is used as the broadest term for all educational institutions.

It is said "the school is a corner-stone of the Republic." That is true if the office of the school in our national life be accurately understood and performed. But in our hurried way we have taken education to mean mere material and practical instruction. Our general thought has come to be, "Let us teach American youth geography, history, chemistry, and the country is safe. Let American youth learn Latin, and the Republic is safe. Let us raise up a race of Euclids, and the Nation is secure."

But is this a true conception of the relation of the school to the Nation? There were few schools among the people when our Nation was founded. Yet the national spirit was strong in the people whose purposes Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson formulated. Many apostles of nationality all through our history have been men not of the highest culture. The best and greatest of them have not been men of finished education. Consider Washington, Lincoln, Jackson. The same is true of leaders of the people in other lands. Of course, some of them have been the finest products of university training. But this one truth is common to all of them: They were

inspired by faith in their people, by a passion for national solidarity, by devotion to high ideals of their country's destiny. Each of them in every land believed in the mission of his own people, and that, in some form, that mission was and is to work righteousness in the world.

Mere learning, then, does not necessarily make citizenship. Knowledge of dead and living languages, mastery of the physical sciences, instruction in higher mathematics—none of these in itself produces patriotism. And an educated man who disregards the common welfare is more dangerous to a Republic than an ignorant man, because he has more resources with which to take from the common good for his own advantage. Even if such a man is not active against the State, and merely contents himself by leaving public affairs alone, his neutral example is a negative influence for evil. His less fortunate neighbors will say: "If this man, with all his education, does not care for the public good, why should I bother myself about it?" And this means the beginning of the decay of the civic sense—that profound personal interest which every citizen must have in the Nation if the Republic is to work out its theory and purpose.

So we see that in a Republic, if the school stops with material knowledge, it has rendered the Nation no service. In monarchies it may be all right for the school to confine itself to science, literature, philosophy, and the like, because such governments do not so much depend upon the citizen as with us. But even in monarchies we find the school nourishing the national spirit. The universities of Germany inspire their German students, first, last and all the time, with the thought of German nationality, German supremacy. But in America this is as much more necessary than in Germany, as the life of our Nation is drawn more directly from the hearts and minds of our millions.

It is plain, then, that the American school must produce something more than book culture. The soul of our American instruction must be American nationality; or, rather, fundamental and world righteousness expressed through the activities of the American Republic.

Your professor of chemistry will tell you that science has been able to reconstruct a grain of wheat, with all of the chemical properties in the exact proportion in which they are found in the natural grain of wheat. So far as science can tell, absolutely nothing has been left out. Yet this grain of wheat which the chemist con-

structs will not grow. So in a Republic, the school which does not produce the spirit of nationality is a dead thing, after all. It is the chemist's grain of wheat, not God's grain of wheat.

In a Republic, then, the great mission of the school is to create the national spirit. The fruit of public instruction in governments like ours must be patriotism. You may produce your man of culture, and yet if you have made him too dainty for the duties of citizenship, you have not only wasted your work, you have actually wrought evil. The most highly cultured man of loftiest mind who yet has not the political spirit is not as useful to a free government as the humblest country lad, if the latter has the civic sense that makes him take a hand in politics. For he is a good citizen, and the educated exquisite is not a good citizen.

Your man of culture may march to the Republic's battle-fields and die for the Nation; but that is not enough. He must live for the Nation. If his education has lifted him above the common duties of citizenship it has robbed him of his civic manhood. And civic manhood is the life of republican institutions.

Let us reduce this to the simplest terms. Citizenship means suffrage. So if the Republic is to endure, every citizen must not only be willing to vote; he must be willing to sacrifice business, convenience, comfort, and every other thing, rather than fail to vote. We read with tears in our eyes the heroic tales of the men who died to give us the right to vote; yet, as we read, we too often neglect that right. Unfortunately, this is true of many college men, and increasingly true. It must cease to be true of every college man. His very equipment commands him to do more for the Nation than men less cultured. And that means activity in politics; for politics is the method through which our form of government works. And politics means the machinery of elections as much as the formulation of policies which the citizen must pass upon at the polls. So the farmer who answers to his political committee for his precinct is performing a duty to the Nation. But the person whose civic sense has been drugged by the refinements of a soulless education until he disdains such work is a deserter from the noblest duties and dearest rights ever bestowed on man. The one defends the pillars of the Republic; the other applies to those pillars the acid of neglect which rots their strength.

Excepting in emergencies or when the political fortunes of some great public man is at stake, many people do not attend to our republican government, even to the extent of voting. And our

republican form of government requires the same attention that the fields of the farmer require, or the business of the merchant, or the shafts of the miner, or the tracks and engine of the railroad man, or the practical conduct of this university. If even a considerable body of our people fail to vote, we have a Republic in name, and not in fact. And so, if the spirit of citizenship is growing dim, the holy flame must be rekindled.

This is the business of the school when considered in its relation to the Nation. The teacher in a Republic must be the high priest of our republican nationality. What says Emerson :

“For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land, or life, if freedom fail?”

And doubt not that freedom will fail if all of us do not give to her our best devotion. Our fathers gave their blood for her ; we are degenerate sons indeed if we do not give at least a little portion of our daily energy and interest for her. Liberty is no indifferent goddess. She will not abide where she is not appreciated. She is not to be courted by neglect. She will not tarry where she is not loved. And the love of words is nothing to her. She must have the love of deeds.

So our institutions of learning, from the humblest country schoolhouse to the greatest university, ought to give some portion of an hour each day to the teaching of nationality, to instruction in the pricelessness of our institutions, to exhortation that the highest duty of every boy and girl is to live and die for the Republic. The method of doing this is the business of the teacher. But whatever the method, it must be done. Woe to us if our appreciation of free institution fails.

We expect to lead this world ; and America will lead the world, but not unless the sense of civic duty is kept as keen as instinct, as exalted as faith. And to keep it so is the duty of every teacher. In a Republic, in short, civic education is the soul of the school. With that the school is God's grain of wheat feeding the world and multiplying itself from this principle of life within it. Without it the school is the chemist's grain of wheat, a mere lifeless imitation.

And patriotism can be taught. Other nations are teaching it. Education is the finest thing in the world if it increases interest in the Nation—if it produces pure, brave and effective citizens. What is so noble as the trained intellect and high character serving the Republic, whether in obscure ward or President's chair—for the

Republic must be served in the one as well as in the other. And to produce such service is the office of the school in the Nation. But education is a baneful thing if it destroys interest in citizenship.

I say the national spirit can be taught in the school. Take an humble example. One day in a certain city in the interior of Japan the words of a song filled the air. There were hundreds of voices. Even in the distance one could tell that they were the voices of youth. The musical sounds drew nearer. Soon the head of a column of school children appeared. Scores, hundreds of little boys marched by, singing with all their might a song of their dear Japan, caroling of their flag of the crimson sun. They were voicing in music the ambition of their lives to serve their country and their heart's hope some day to die for their beloved land. Their notes were militant, but full of soul. Japan is without religion as we understand that term; but her statesmen have made devotion to the empire the religion of its multiplying millions.

So we see that even little Japan has its lesson for us. There can be no substitute for religion; but the next highest phase of human thought and feeling is that devotion to one's land which we call patriotism. Real education does not destroy pride in the Nation or weaken our conception of the duty of the citizen. But in a Republic real education means that the sense of citizenship must be the beginning and the end of it. I can think of nothing so admirable as the product of the American school whose practical devotion to the Republic has been intensified by his culture; of nothing so glorious as the American refined by education, and yet whose national spirit has been strengthened by his learning.

So the American school must be the great nourisher of the Nation. The Nation, the Nation, always the Nation! The school for the Nation! All education for the Nation! Everything for the Nation! When you write beneath your calculation in higher mathematics, "*quod erat demonstrandum*," it must be our Nation of which those words are written. When you prepare an historical thesis, it must be our Nation for which your studies tell you that God has been preparing through all the ages. The test tube must reveal something more than the mysteries of force and matter; through all the gases of the laboratory you must see our Nation—God's great agent of righteousness in the world.

In a Republic, too, the school must teach conservatism. In monarchies the university has always been the generator of radicalism. In a Republic the reverse must be true, because the Repub-

lic is the reverse of the monarchy. No government can be good unless it is steady, moderate, sane. The ballast of a monarchy is the unchanging form of its administration; and so, despite its defects, it sails steadily. But the ballast of a Republic must be the sober second thought of its citizens. We will end in confusion if we are swept off our feet every now and then by unsound agitations, by gusts of passion, by storms of prejudice. On shipboard I never tire of hearing the command from the bridge, "Steady as she goes." That is the word for our Republic. Let us see to it that our national policies are right, and then "steady as she goes." Let our course as a Nation be determined by the fixed stars of the highest ideals, and then "steady as she goes." Yield not to the selfish purposes of any man or class of men, but consider only the good of the whole American people, and by that high national wisdom keep the ship "steady as she goes." Conservatism, then, instruction in the spirit of moderation, is the second great duty of the school as an agency of our national life, "steady as she goes."

Yet all these will not suffice. Education is nothing if the spirit of nationality is extinguished. And even the spirit of nationality can not save us if we are a variable and eccentric people. Therefore, conservatism. But even something more than this is needed, and that something is righteousness. There is the final word in all education. And the highest formula of righteousness which the world has ever produced is that philosophy of life and death which we call the Gospel of Christ. That statement is not accurate, for the world did not produce Christianity. It has a higher origin. It is God's word to the world. He who understands it has the secret of good thinking and good doing. And so in the last analysis, considering the school merely as an influence in national life, we rise on the steps of reasoning to the eternal throne of all real power. The old mother who has had neither time nor opportunity for learning, and yet knows by a higher evidence than learning can afford that God reigns and rules the world and all the worlds, is wiser than the most cultured professor who sits in the seats of knowledge, but who questions that greatest fact in the universe. Speaking of the mission of the school in the Nation, we may paraphrase the sacred word and say, "And now abide patriotism, conservatism, righteousness, but the greatest of these is righteousness."

This has a definite connection with the duty of the school to teach nationality; for history tells us that, in spite of occasional exceptions to the contrary, the highest expression of the national

spirit, the strongest manifestation of civic ideals have been among peoples whose faith has been simple, pure, profound. There is no time for analysis of this tremendous fact. I merely point you to the fact. And whatever you do, do not fight a fact. Truth is the one unconquerable thing in all the universe. So, considered merely as a factor in free institutions, the school must foster the religious spirit.

It is appropriate that these words be spoken here. For this institution, from its youth as a college to its maturity as a university, has been true to these ideals. It sprang from the people. It looked for inspiration to the great Source of all life and light. It considered itself the Republic's servant. Heroic has been its history. Its faculty in early days suffered hardship. Its students were drawn from farm and shop—children of men who feared God and loved the Nation and ate their bread by the sweat of their faces. Unpoisoned by luxury, unweakened by doubt, they were, teacher and student, the stuff of which righteous and unconquerable nations are builded. Many of its professors refused chairs in famous universities and gave their lives to this college of the people—missionaries of Christian education. Many of its students, burdened by poverty—or blessed by it—suffered physical hunger that their minds and souls might grow strong and noble under such teaching. And so DePauw has been the mother of citizenship as well as of culture.

Now that we are in the day of material prosperity, fail not to remember DePauw's heroic past. Fail not in stern devotion to these ideals. Fail not to justify the faith of those plain people whose hard won earnings sustained Asbury, or of those splendid men who poured their wealth into DePauw, chief of whom was that great layman whose name we are proud to bear.

And we will not fail. Our past is proof that we will be faithful. Our present is promise that we will be true. This event marks the rising tide of our prosperity and progress. We can not mar, if we would, the noble and lifelong service of President Gobin, whose superb administration now draws to a close, and who hands his work, finished and rounded, over to his successor. There is never an edifice, no matter how noble, that does not have its master builders; and one of the master builders of DePauw is Hillary A. Gobin, who is loved by the alumni of this university and by the Methodists and the whole people of Indiana. All honor to him and to each of his predecessors, whose accumulated achievements are

now placed under the guiding hand of the young and brilliant administrator whom we this day install as our president.

The record and character of President Hughes is guarantee of our fidelity to our traditional purposes of citizenship and culture. He is full of youth's fine energy, regulated by a mind of moderation. And what is so good as young manhood's strength, directed by the just judgments of conservatism? Like our university, he sprang from the people; like it, he looks for guidance to the Most High, and finds his real reward in the unselfish service of his fellow-man; like it, he believes in the divine destiny of our Nation and considers citizenship in the Republic a sacred thing. Thus has nature, training, faith, made him our kinsman, and in him we hail a brother as our president.

PRESIDENT J. W. BASHFORD'S CHARGE TO DR. HUGHES

President Hughes—Your conscience will make possibilities spell responsibilities; hence my charge consists in pointing out some of the possibilities which await you in the new field of service to which you have been called. The first and perhaps the greatest possibility which awaits you is the possibility of personal influence upon individual students. There is no influence equal to that of character. But character, however strong and unselfish, can not do its work unless one's spirit is known. Nor, indeed, can you secure the deepest hold upon a student unless you know his spirit; and this implies mutual acquaintance. I need not urge you to cultivate the young men and women committed to your trust.

The influence of a Professor Baker over the brilliant Senator who has spoken so wisely to-day; the influence of a teacher like our Dr. McCabe over your own life or that of Senator Fairbanks; the influence of President Eliot over Theodore Roosevelt, of Staupitz over Luther, of Aristotle over Alexander, of Socrates over Plato, of the Great Teacher over St. John, are illustrations of the unmeasured power which a teacher can exercise over young men at the beginning of their careers.

Best of all, you are a Christian president in a Christian college; it is possible for you not only to appeal to ambition and to rouse the conscience, but to touch the deepest springs of spiritual life. You have been a pastor with a personal sway over perhaps five thousand people. But you enter to-day upon the greatest pastorate in your career. In personal contact during the next few years with thousands of young people who will help mold our civilization, your possibilities are simply infinite.

But a second and even more potent source of influence lies in your selection of fellow-teachers. I am sure that you do not dream of any immediate and revolutionary reconstruction of your faculty. But if DePauw grows, as I am sure she will, you will be called upon next June to name two or three young people to serve as tutors. Members of the faculty will make helpful suggestions; the members of your board of trustees will prove wise counselors; but the responsibility of selecting teachers who, during the next thirty or

forty years will be molding students at DePauw and even at other universities, will rest upon you. You may indeed be thankful if you are called upon to nominate only young people who may be elected on trial, because your judgment in forecasting the future influence of a teacher will not prove infallible, and you will be glad at times to make changes before fixing a professor upon a university for life. Only common sense and experience and the inspiration of the Omniscient One can guide to right choices of fellow-workers. Here is a little recognized but exceedingly important responsibility which rests upon you. When President Berry nominated Samuel A. Lattimore as a tutor in Asbury University one day in 1850, he did as great a work for this college as he accomplished throughout his personal administration. When Matthew Simpson selected W. C. Larrabee for the chair of mathematics at Asbury, he was guided in this, as in many a turning point in history, by wisdom from on high.

Slow as the changes may seem to take place in a college faculty, nevertheless, with the inevitable losses through sickness and death, and with the assured growth of DePauw, in case you remain here ten years, you will name fifteen or twenty men for lifelong positions, and hundreds for similar positions elsewhere, in which they will mold the thinking and stamp their influence upon the lives of thousands of students at just that age when young people's lives are ready to be touched to finer issues or degraded to sordid aims. In meeting this responsibility you may not increase your immediate fame; but you will exercise an influence upon DePauw and upon the Church and the Nation which are simply incalculable. The world has forgotten, if it ever knew, who nominated Simpson for DePauw, Thompson for Ohio Wesleyan, Warren for Boston University, Hopkins for Williams, McCosh for Princeton, or Eliot for Harvard; the world does not remember who nominated Agassiz for Harvard, Guyot for Princeton, and Godet for Neuchatel; the world never knew what teacher trained Guyot, Godet and Agassiz at Neuchatel; the world does not know who nominated Sir William Hamilton for Edinburgh, Jowett and Caird and Green for Oxford and Cambridge, Kant for Koenigsburg, Julius Muller and Mommsen for Berlin; the world scarcely knows even the universities at which Wesley and Calvin and Luther, Abelard and Aquinas and Augustine studied and taught; but the men who selected such teachers were the creators of civilizations. "Better is one former than a thousand reformers."

But there is a third task which must never supplant your personal work with students and the building up of a great faculty at DePauw, but which must supplement these tasks, if your work is to prove eternal. That task is the discovery of prophetic, far-seeing spirits among great laymen and women and the unfolding to them of their possibilities in broadening the functions of the university. It is a divine task to select a teacher who, like your old professor in Greek, will, during half a century, stamp his character upon twenty thousand young people, who, in their turn, will shape the civilization of the century. But while Professor Williams taught with us for fifty-six years, do not think that his magnificent services exhausted the benefaction of his boyhood companion and lifelong friend, John R. Wright, who was known only as a man of business, but who endowed the chair which made Professor Williams's services possible. The endowment is permanent, and if the world lasts so long, Professor Williams will have a score, or a hundred, or even a thousand successors, whose work is made possible by Mr. Wright's foundation. College endowments are even more permanent than the civil governments under whose protection the universities are founded. The foundations of Cambridge and Oxford were untouched by the English revolution and the civil wars. The Sorbonne and the University of Paris were not overthrown even by the French revolution. The Universities of Heidelberg and Leipsic and Munich and Jena and Halle, of Padua and Bologna, are far older than the German and Italian nations. Indeed, it was the Greek and Roman teachers who embodied the classics in libraries and safely transmitted ancient civilization to the modern world across the weltering sea of the Dark Ages, just as it was the schools of the prophets which preserved for the Christian Church the teachings of the Old Testament after the fall of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

If you can secure at DePauw the endowment of a dozen chairs—and this is certainly possible—you will lay the foundations of Christian culture in one of the great commonwealths of the Western continent for the next five thousand years. Instead of writing a book, you and the laymen associated with you will make possible the training of whole schools of journalism and of literature. While continuing to preach yourself, you and the men and women who will consecrate their wealth to this enterprise will make possible the founding of a school of the prophets who will pass the torch of religion down to the latest ages. Without entering politics

yourself, you will make possible the training of the statesmen of the Republic. Without going as a missionary, you will mold the civilizations of China and Africa and the islands of the seas.

Will the audience permit me to address part of my charge to you? I urge you to give President Hughes the heartiest co-operation. Bear him up to God in your prayers. Aid him by your sympathies, by encouraging reports of the beginnings of success, by your co-operation in his labors, by your efforts in response to his appeals. Above all, do not cripple him and destroy the possibilities of the university by false expectations of immediate results. As well might the farmer who has just sown the seed expect a harvest next week as for DePauw to expect an endowment next year. Harvard reported invested funds of \$3,600,000 in 1880 and \$12,600,000 in 1900. Nearly three times as much money came to the university during the last twenty years of the century as during the first two hundred and forty-four years of her history. President Eliot secured more money last year than during the first ten years of his presidency. Only the magical theory of prayer and effort can lead the friends of the university to the wild dream that a suitable endowment for the DePauw of the twentieth century can be realized in one year, or five years. By your united efforts and sacrifices you will insure the growth of the university under President Hughes. But you must look here, as in other parts of the Master's field, first for the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.

In a word, your fellowship is with students—with the young and open-minded and enthusiastic—and you must set their ideals in the heavens above them and make these ideals transfigure their daily lives. Your fellowship is with a noble and consecrated band of teachers, and you must help to select a body of men and women who shall create the civilization of the twentieth century and of the ages to follow. Your fellowship is with men of business, with far-seeing, prophetic philanthropists, and you are to help these people to become workers together with God.

THE MEANINGS OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Inaugural Address of Rev. Edwin Holt Hughes, S. T. D., as President of
DePauw University.

The figure of speech that best characterizes the present aspects of educational life is this: The hour is one of "dissolving views." The last two decades have thrown old theories into confusion. New problems have arisen. The possible directions of educational progress are so many, and fresh guidance may open such surprising ways, that hasty prophecies are likely to return in the shape of plagues. He would be daring indeed who would attempt to chart this restless sea, to mark all perilous rocks, to time the tides, to distinguish between eddies and currents, to point on to safe harbors. And if prophecy is dangerous, so likewise is an attempt to fit educational history into the present life of our institutions of learning. The perplexing things now are just the things that are new. The educator often searches in vain for historical parallels. He feels that at times he must be a discoverer rather than a disciple. Columbus must not look for precedents when he seeks to find a new world; the original channel is never sprinkled with lights.

Certainly in many respects these nautical metaphors suit the situation to-day. Great men have gone before us: Gamaliel and Hillel, Plato and Aristotle, Augustine and Origen, Alcuin and Abelard, Arnold and Hopkins, and scores of others whose names flash out of a vast record. They piloted noble crafts, but they did not sail on our ocean. There have been educational explorers and pioneers who have opened new paths and pushed beyond the borders of previous experience. It may be said that our age sometimes calls for such venturous leadership. It demands innovations. The pressure of that demand comes heavily upon the teachers and trustees of the period. How can history teach us the value of a straight innovation? Does it not require two lines to constitute a parallel? And where can we find a second line to place beside many a modern line of educational trend? Did the school of Socrates dovetail its course into that of the Athens' College of Medicine? Was Socrates himself a member of the athletic board ex-officio? Did the students

elect their studies or did the great teacher do all the electing? Such questions hint that the past may not offer a full solution for the specific problems of the present hour.

But what now have we done? If prophecy is dangerous because of the shiftings and uncertainties in movements of the present; and if history is comparatively silent concerning the problems that throng us now, what recourse of speech remains? If we can not talk about past, present, or future, are we not shut away from all discussion? Nay, not so! If the traveler may not describe the places visited, the spot where he now stands, the cities whose towers coax him forward, he may still speak of the sky that hangs above all; of the atmosphere that surrounds all; of the sun that shines over all. So if past, present, and future, as peculiar periods, are taken from discussion, we are driven to those timeless ideas and ideals which have given impulse and passion to all the promoters of true education.

I. It is a sober statement of facts when we affirm that for eighteen hundred years the Church has been the chief propagator of learning. In the centuries before Christ, Egypt, Assyria, and Greece had their schools and scholars; but education was never diffused among the people. The spirit of diffusion came with the dominance of the new faith. That wave of diffusion may be said to have come to its crest in our country and in our century. None the less it flowed over all the years. For a time the movement sped in spite of the national spirit. Hallam admits that "for five centuries every part of knowledge was almost wholly confined to the ecclesiastical order." David Hume was no lover of the Church, yet history forced from him the admission that in the days of the great Alfred "the monasteries were the only seats of learning." If the influence of the Church schools could be taken from the history of Europe, the old barbarism would still reign there. In America, Church and colony were united; yet it may not be denied that the impulse toward higher education sprang from the heart of the Church of Christ. The first college had a Christian birth, and bears to this day the name of a Christian minister, John Harvard. The second college was William and Mary. The Virginia Assembly, which gave it a doubly royal name, gave it also a doubly religious purpose, and mentioned among its objects "the supply of the ministry" and "the promotion of piety." The third college was Yale. The society that took the initial steps for its founding was composed of "eleven ministers." An authority

makes the statement that one hundred and four of the first one hundred and nineteen colleges established in the United States had a distinctively Christian origin. [Colleges in America, Barker, p. 49.] The ultimate history of America will credit the Church of Christ with the primary and supreme influence in our country's educational life.

In due season the influence of the Church so moved upon the State that institutions under civic control were founded. It is a mighty compliment to the Christian forces of the nation that their ideals at last permeated the State. Amid all the discussions as to the relation of State colleges and Church colleges, it should in justice be held in mind that the Church has been the mother and the home of education in this Republic. If the prophecies so often made at the present time should prove true and the schools of the Church be killed by the schools of the State, history would offer few clearer and sadder instances of wholesale matricide! But he who imagines such an outcome is lacking in vision. The State schools are here, and they will remain. Surely no one would care to decree that all young people must attend an institution of private or denominational founding. The colleges of such private and denominational control have given noble service to our various States. They now have a right to ask for a fair field; have a right to request that there be no needless duplication of collegiate work; have a right to demand that there be no partiality shown in the selection of teachers, principals, and superintendents; have a right to assert the glory of their own mission. But more than these rights they can not claim. Their work must be positive and constructive, the strengthening of the various departments, the sending out of men and women of intellect and character. Given these worthy conditions the schools of the Church will not die. They may have some spells of serious sickness. Or they may change their places of residence. Or they may, when proper love prevails, get married. But discouraged friends and hopeful enemies may call the hearse away from our doors. Our schools are the wards of a deathless Church. The Methodist Episcopal branch, though still young, prayed over the cradle of the Republic. Should our Republic perish, that Church will pray at its grave, and among the petitions will be one for a glorious resurrection. The Church will not die; neither will its institutions. To be specific: DePauw University has outlived two generations of men. Our grandfathers were its godfathers. Since its birth the cemeteries of Indiana have received the

sacred dust of millions; and when the bodies of all here present are held at last to the bosom of mother earth, this university will live on. It is the child of a lasting purpose, and it has an abiding life. As that life flows ceaselessly onward through many administrations we may represent this institution as confidently applying to itself the claim of the laureate's "Brook:"

"Men may come, and men may go;
But I go on forever."

All of our presidents and professors have grouped themselves about the conviction, so prominent in the life of the universal Church, that humanity needs institutions of higher learning under Christian auspices. There is not time now to pay sufficient tribute to the goodly succession. It may be granted, however, to tarry a moment with the name of Matthew Simpson. Without doubt the personality of our first president has projected itself thus far and has had a decided relation to these six decades of the University's history. It is not now too early to suggest that DePauw University should lead in the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of his birth. On the twenty-first of June, 1911, a statue of our pioneer president should be unveiled on our campus, and a generous fund should be turned over to the University as an abiding memorial of his service here. His divinely magnetic life consecrated itself to the task of arousing among the early settlers of Indiana a fine zeal for Christian education. What our first president began, his successors have faithfully conserved and continued. They walk down the years with heroic step—Lucien Berry and Daniel Curry, Thomas Bowman and Reuben Andrus, Alexander Martin and John P. D. John, Hillary A. Gobin and William H. Hickman. Different men they have been, and we feel the sense of contrast as we pronounce their names. Yet more conspicuous than the variety of their powers was the unity of their aim—to give to Indiana and to the Methodist Episcopal Church a scholastic center of culture and power, to furnish young men and women with the highest learning under the holiest inspirations. Through these sixty-six years our leaders have known much of anxiety—yea, much of agony, at times. But they have moved steadfastly toward one goal of goals, and the life of each is in the University to-day!

And around that same conviction our benefactors have gathered themselves. Would that the whole list might be called and all

the companions in this far-reaching philanthropy be given open praise! We can speak of them only by speaking of their distinguished representative whose honored name this institution bears. When Washington C. DePauw came forward with his earnest and lavish plans, he was moved by a mature and intelligent interest. His letters show a marvelous appreciation of what constitutes a university. Educators of wide experience would all agree that his conceptions of university life were as large as his generosity. What inspired him and all his co-givers and co-workers? There is but one reply: The conviction that the world needed advanced education suffused and dominated by the religious spirit. All these gave gladly for one purpose of purposes—and the gift of each is in the university to-day!

The formal utterances of our leaders all focus themselves upon one point. Three inaugural addresses may still be read—that of Dr. Simpson, that of Dr. Martin, that of Dr. John. They represent the period of founding, the period of enlargement, the period of transition. One glows with oratorical fervor; one moves in rugged and measured periods; one shows the mastery of educational principles. But, though written years apart, they still reveal a perennial subject. Each one speaks in sure tones as to the permanent necessity of Christian education. The needs of the passing hour are treated, but the final stress is laid firmly upon the uttermost importance of that learning which exalts faith and character. Each brings all great issues to the One who gave lessons in the unroofed school room of Galilee, and who stands in splendid loneliness as the Great Teacher. Amid all debates as to policy, all skepticism as to method, all discussion as to finance, one postulate is put forth unwaveringly: The Church has a duty in reference to education. The conclusion always is that Christian people must assume a glorious burden and must provide institutions that reckon deeply with the spirit of man.

II. Now it is with just that fact that this address deals. That the Church has ever felt it a duty to educate youth is in itself a significant thing; for the present hour it is *the* significant thing. Therefore the theme is: The Meanings of Christian Education. The effort will be to make deductions from the fact that for nearly two millenniums the Church of Christ has sought to promote education and that it still insists upon its duty in that high respect. What necessary admissions lie folded in that fact? The question thus broadly stated is an advantage because it releases us for the time

from policies and sets us free to ideals. The truth is that while an ideal may be helpless unless assisted by a policy, a policy is helpful only as it works toward an ideal. A policy may fall within an ideal; but an ideal always breaks from the narrowness of a policy. There is ever relief in leaving the field where policies contest, and seeking that lofty region where live in harmony the unquestioned ideals.

The first implication necessarily held in the fact that the Christian Church has founded and fostered institutions of learning may be stated in this form of subject: *The practicalness of the intellectual life*. A leader of modern thought has put this word into his latest book: "Withdraw the practical world and the theoretic world would die. Cancel the theoretic world and the practical world would lapse into the original darkness. The university is the one great symbol of the union of these two interests." [Ultimate Conceptions of Faith, George A. Gordon, pp. 56, 57.] In our land and age the mere cloister has not been a popular institution. There has been a demand that the windows of the study should be open so that the life of the world might flow in, and that the doors should be open so that the enlarged life of the student might flow out. The last few decades have given us a signal illustration of this constant interaction between the practical life of the world and the intellectual life of the college. What seer foretold the amazing changes that were to be made in the educational life of our country by the application of steam and electricity to the use of mankind? The work-a-day needs of construction, manufacture, and transportation presented themselves at the college doors and said: "You have furnished lawyers, doctors, teachers, and ministers. Now we need men of developed brains who will give themselves to the applied sciences." The history of education offers few more significant chapters than that which records the change in our universities and colleges to meet this quick change in the big world. In response to the demand, technical schools or departments almost leaped into the field. Readjustments were made on an ample scale. In many of our States thousands of young men have been equipped to solve the problems presented by the new powers of steam and electricity. The critics of institutions of learning, who had long declared higher education a luxury or an ornament, now saw it united with the huge activities of the modern age. What an illustration this is of the bearing of learning on the more material practicalities!

All this inevitably carries the question on to the application to

commercial life. England has recently been aroused by a message from one of her intellectual leaders. The address of Sir Norman Lockyer, as president of the British Association for the current year, gives the relation of higher education to commerce a surprising emphasis. [Scientific American Supplements, October 3 and 10, 1903.] The title is "The Influence of Brain-power on History." Evidently the title and the mode of treatment were both suggested by Captain Mahan's great book, "The Influence of Sea-power on History." This presidential address passionately advises that Britain must found more colleges if she is to keep industrial and commercial leadership; it locates the final strength of her national rivals in superior university equipments; it boldly urges that England give to the founding of new institutions of higher learning a figure equal to her astounding expenditure for a great navy. And this plea for advanced education is made in the name of England's commerce! It is much like affirming that the gravity of the sun determines the orbit and speed of some huge star.

Yet it is a safe saying that all these proofs and claims represent what has been going on in higher and deeper ways for many years. Great buildings are not the finalities of civilization; intensive farming may not fully bring the era of that imagery which promises that "the desert shall blossom as the rose;" rapid transit is not the only way of advance to the goal of the race. Long before the technical education had fully come, and long before the astonished Britons had heard Sir Norman Lockyer's awakening address, our colleges were furnishing leaders for the sacred movements of life. Considering the newness of our territory, the land yet untilled, the hills yet unopened, the streams yet unspanned, the miles yet untracked, it is remarkable that this pulsing age has been at all patient with our institutions of learning. Was its patience born of the feeling that our colleges were, after all, the sources of a higher practicalness? Did the people have a conviction, which never arose to full definition, that life is more than meat? At any rate, the children of farmers and millmen turned to the schools. The man of the soil felt that the best harvest of all his life might be an educated son, while the man of the factory felt that he could hope for no better product of his manual labor than the intellectual development of his child. There is a grand pathos in the sight of thousands of fathers and mothers working for weary years and counting it all joy if at last the boy and girl might bear home a parchment. Now all this labor was not inspired by the idea that the

children might enjoy a luxury or wear an ornament; rather was it inspired by the thought that in some way the education touched profound and serious issues and gave equipment for some real success. That faith has been amply vindicated by the results. If the practical service given to this Nation by our college men were removed from our past, large and desolate would be the gaps in our history. Into the school rooms, into the physicians' offices, into our courts, into our pulpits, into our stores, into our homes, the young men and young women of our institutions have gone; and he who does not think that they have gone with increased capacity, and that they have splendidly answered the genuine needs of life, has lost his power as an observer. The magnificent statue of our martyred President in Lincoln Park, Chicago, is a parable in stone and bronze. It represents the great commoner as having just arisen from the chair of thought to carry his plan forth into resolute deed. The suggestion of the monument is none too large for the great truth. The contemplative life is the forerunner of the practical life. The true thinker is evermore the true worker.

It were vain enough to insist further upon this commonplace. An extreme fact may carry with it all the less questioned facts. Poetry would by many be considered the least practical of intellectual forms of service. The poet, some declare, is the dreamer, the man who lives on inaccessible heights, the idealist who dwells apart from throbbing life. But who can measure the practicalness of the poet's work? We need not point now to the service of agitation rendered by our New England poets in the great anti-slavery struggle. Simpler illustrations are at hand. Places and persons and trades have been rescued from insignificance or forgetfulness or indifference by the poet's power of service. The traveler down the Rhine passes towns and castles of historic interest. But the interest reaches its height when small Bingen comes to view. Why is this? Because that village was lifted by the hand of a poet who sang—not with excess of skill, one might say—of "fair Bingen on the Rhine." When the Nation was ready to forget the man of the April ride, Longfellow came forward and set on high the name of Paul Revere, giving him a place among the heroes of the Revolution. He did a like service for a trade. His lines on "The Village Blacksmith" have entered a thousand shops, have been heard among the sounds of anvils and hammers, and have flashed more brightly than the flying sparks. Little children and men and women have been educated to the sense of labor's dignity. No words can ever fully

estimate the practical effect of this one poem. These are well-nigh homely illustrations of the fact that the dreamiest realm of the intellectual life may render a vast service in the glorifying of place and event and work. Real poetry is ever practical. It recovers the ideals of mankind. It finds the lost soul of the world. Mrs. Browning's poetic tribute to the poets may have its touches of exaggeration, but its trend offers a just estimate of the serviceableness of poetry. "Aurora Leigh," in which the tribute falls, is in itself a contribution to sociology. Well does this poetess say:

"I write so
Of the only truth-tellers now left to God,
The only speakers of essential truth
Opposed to relative, comparative,
And temporal truth; the only holders by
His sun-skirts through conventional gray glooms;
The only teachers who instruct mankind
From just a shadow on a charnel wall,
To find man's veritable stature out,
Erect, sublime, the measure of a man,
And that's the measure of an angel, says
The apostle. Ay, and while your common men
Build pyramids, gauge railroads, reign, reap, dine,
And dust the flaunty carpets of the world
For kings to walk on or our senators,
The poet suddenly will catch them up,
With his voice like a thunder: 'This is soul;
This is life; this word is being said in heaven,
Here's God down on us! What are you about?'
How all those workers start amid their work,
Look up, look round, and feel a moment's space,
That carpet-dusting, though a pretty trade,
Is not the imperative labor, after all."

Nor does this reference to the practicalness of poetry end the theme. All true thought at last reaches life. The trite illustration of the architect's mental plan preceding the material structure is none too strong to express the sweeping reality. It is a large blunder to consider the outer as the only practical. The primary accomplishments are inner; the initial contests of all history take place in mind and heart. Our period is prone to slur this fundamental truth. We have fallen in love with the objective. The word "visionary" is an uncomplimentary term; the title of "theorist" has fallen into disgrace. And yet it remains true that the real visionaries and the real theorists are the saving persons. An

essayist of a previous generation was guilty of the superficial statement that there is no more reason for quarreling over an opinion than for quarreling over a potato. The context puts a grain of sense into this otherwise inane observation; but it does not redeem the remark from its essential folly. Our Civil War was in the last analysis a contest of opinions. Two interpretations of the Constitution battled with each other in a realm where brains sweat blood long before any soldier came to his glorious martyrdom. Issue was joined to issue; but every real issue was backed by an opinion. The question of slavery was really a doctrine of humanity; the question of unity was really a doctrine of government. Men said long ago that the interpretation of the Constitution was an abstract matter, academic rather than practical. But the opinion worked toward life. The battle passed from mind and spirit out to flesh and blood. Ere the opinions had ceased their clashing, a million coats of blue and gray had faded, and more than three hundred thousand men had answered Father Abraham's call and poured the red, pathetic stream of reconciliation upon the Nation's altar. The inner became the terrible outer; the abstract became the deadly concrete; the opinions became the most ghastly facts of a century.

The first implication has a still higher meaning. It is easy for men to deceive themselves in cases where the inner viewpoint does not work out into some tragic form. Hence in this era of religious freedom, it is often asserted that theological opinion is of minor importance. There is some justice in the observation; but it needs to be guarded. Hebrew vowel points may well pass from the field of theological controversy; but the Hebrew conceptions of the unity and spirituality of Jehovah must be evermore defended. If debate has sometimes ranged about the petty, it does not follow that we should withdraw debate from the vast. A contrast here will show the practicalness of the intellectual life in its relation to moral welfare. The eighteenth century saw two men contesting for the mental suffrage of Great Britain. One was Lord Bolingbroke, the other was John Wesley. If they were not rivals in personal feeling, they were rivals in a more meaningful way. Bolingbroke came with his denials, Wesley with his affirmations. The one offered doubt, the other faith. The one banished God after the fashion of the Deists, the other brought Him near after the fashion of the Christians. England stood at the pause. But in the end Wesley worsted Bolingbroke, and the evangelism of his brain and heart defeated the negations of the nobleman. What unspeakably practical effects were

wrapped up in that contest of opinion! Who does not know that England's history for two centuries is immeasurably different from what it would have been if Bolingbroke had been victor? And who can measure the influence in this new country of the triumph of Wesley's conception of life? Had our leader failed, this inauguration event would never have taken place; many gracious institutions of mercy and help would have no room in our modern life, and every palace and cottage between these two great oceans would have been filled by a different moral atmosphere. The defeat of Bolingbroke's opinions by those of John Wesley started a power more utterly practical than any which drives the wheels of the working world or moves to issue the commercial forces of this bustling age.

The second implication that lies folded in the fact of Christian education relates to *the fearlessness of the religious life*. After the utter failure of bloody persecutions to crush out the new faith, the contest passed from a physical up to an intellectual form. In the attempt to destroy Christianity, Celsus was in a sense a successor of Nero. Both sought the same end—the one using weapons of fire and sword, the other weapons of syllogism and satire. In our own time and country the contest lies almost wholly in the intellectual realm. It is, then, exceedingly suggestive that the Church has not been afraid to sharpen minds by the thousands. Knowing that the forces that sought to discredit her theme and her mission were intellectual, she has still gone forward in the work of developing intellectual forces. The fine fearlessness of that procedure has never yet been sufficiently emphasized. If, in the days of physical persecution, the Church had forged swords, well knowing that some of them would be used against her, it would have indicated an unshaken confidence in her power to survive. The illustration does not overstate the case on the intellectual side. The Church has opened schools for the training of minds, well knowing that some of her best equipped scholars would turn their developed powers against her life. Yet in spite of Hume and a thousand less conspicuous opponents of the Christian faith, who were trained under her inspiration, she has serenely continued the work of founding and maintaining institutions of learning. She has felt that the truth of God must win, and that her part was to set it free to fight its great battles. It is said that the sun draws up from the earth the mists that dim the light; but it is just as true that the sun at length smites the mists and drives them back again to earth. The final victory is

with light. Thus, although the Church has known that her own power would sometimes lift up the forces that battle against her, she has still lifted and lifted and lifted, assured that radiance is mightier and more persistent than gloom. Therefore, one of the deeper meanings of Christian education is that religious faith has no fear of knowledge.

It may be urged here that the Church has not always shown an open spirit. It is sometimes sweepingly asserted that the scientist has first found his facts and then has made the theory find him, while the theologian has first found his theory and then has made himself find the facts. The word is true of some scientists and of some theologians. Dogmatism is not distinctive of any one class. There have been open-minded theologians and shut-minded scientists, and open-minded scientists and shut-minded theologians. For either party to claim a monopoly of eagerness for truth is both false and insulting. And, besides, is the theologian the only representative of the Church? Was the place of Hugh Miller in the Church of Scotland less sure than that of Chalmers? In the Christian colleges of to-day is science alone, or theology alone? Or are not both companions in the curricula? We may well have done with the raising of unreal issues. The theologian and the scientist are partners in the quest for truth.

This does not mean that the Church has always shown a full readiness of mind. She has felt herself the guardian of an inestimable treasure, and she has sometimes shown undue anxiety. Watchmen are usually watchful, even to the point of suspicion; very often they look for danger where no danger lurks. But it is easy to press too strongly this indictment. The contest with Galileo has been made to do dramatic service at this point. The fact is that the persecuting pope is not the exemplar of theology any more than is the recanting Galileo the exemplar of science. It is worth while to have in the world an organization that answers the ends of conservatism. Between those who regard newness as a test of truth and those who regard oldness as such there is little to choose. But in the long run of history it is well to have a body that makes every novel theory pass the severest tests. The Church has given a real service just here, even allowing that she has frequently overdone the conservative function. If the official Church met Galileo with a demand for silence, let us remember that Galileo himself was a product of the essential Church. If many theologians accosted Darwin not with arguments, but with wailings, let us bethink ourselves

that Darwin himself was not the product of a heathen or atheistic country, but was rather the son of a college that bore the name of Christ.

To be sure, there is always danger of hampering freedom when any authority stands back of an institution of learning; but does this mean that all colleges should be without real auspices? It was inevitable that the zealous debater should have his turn here. He has asked blandly: Is there any such thing as Methodist mathematics, or Presbyterian philology, or Congregational chemistry? This way of putting the case is both specious and superficial. By turning the name of any educational auspices into an adjective it is easy to score a cheap point. It might as reasonably be asked: Is there any such a thing as Maryland mathematics, or Pennsylvania philology, or California chemistry? Yet again the question could be put: Is there any such a thing as Stanford science, or Cornell chemistry, or Girard Greek? These questions would only prove that their propounder was educated in a nameless logic! A university is not a Melchizedek; it must have parentage and management. Colleges in our Nation are maintained by private persons, State organizations, or ecclesiastical bodies. Which type of control has tended most to interfere with liberty of teaching it would be hard to say. Perhaps just at this time most men would declare that the institutions endowed by private individuals had suffered most from such interference. In his address at the recent inauguration of a president at the University of Arizona, President Wheeler, of the University of California, said of a State university presidency that: "Too often the position had been made the football of shifting popular moods, or party politics; or, worse yet, of factional strife." And doubtless there have been instances where the Church, too, has erred by placing needless limitations upon teaching. Yet really, considering these days of strong personal views, party ties, and religious convictions, it is an amazing thing that there have been so few unrighteous attempts to close the mouths of teachers.

It should be urged, also, in order to get a level view of the whole problem, that no institution of learning, whether governed by State or Church or individual, can allow itself to stand for the freakish and foolish views of every alleged instructor. However difficult it may be to draw the line between the liberty of truth and the license of error, we all know that such a line exists and that it must sometimes be drawn straight and deep. If the rich man who loves the home founds a university, it can not be expected that he will permit

there the teaching of free-love. If the State founds a university, it can not be expected that it will allow there the teaching of treason and anarchy. And if the Church founds a university, it can not be expected that she will tolerate there the teaching of immorality and atheism. In all cases the liberty has its bounds. The American people have been so sensitive about freedom that they have sometimes forgotten about truth. They have been so impressed by the danger of repression that they have not always heeded the peril of expression. They have felt sure that truth must be set free before it can set the world free; but they have not always realized that the freeing of error may mean the imprisoning of the world. As long as we can deal with admitted truth and admitted error, our problem is a simple one and has a quick solution. Concerning the questioned we can only assert that no man has a right to accept hospitality in order that he may ravage a home, or to receive the support of State and Church in order that he may tear the foundations from beneath both. That the Church does sometimes need the lesson of breadth, its most devoted adherents would not deny; but they will yet declare that the sentiment of Whittier's poem to the alumni of the Quaker school belongs to educational Christendom:

“We need not pray over the Pharisee's prayer,
Nor claim that our wisdom is Benjamin's share.
Truth to us and to others is equal and one;
Shall we bottle the free air or hoard up the sun?”

The question is not: What shall we do with the free air? There is but one reply to that. It is not: What shall we do with sunlight? There is but one reply to that. Rather the question is: What shall we do with the poisonous gases? Or: What shall we do with the fires that scorch and wither life? Allowing all lapses, it may be fairly asserted that our Christian schools have been the champions of free intellectuality. With a dauntless confidence they have trained the minds of the youth. This confidence has been clearly justified; for no religious denomination in our Republic has shaken itself free from the burden of providing education, and has still maintained a wide, long, influential, and respected life. The founders of the Christian colleges, their successors in maintenance, and all devout hearts that have held dear the educational interests of the Church, have rested under the unwavering conviction that truth, like light, travels in straight lines, and that the honest pursuer will find himself standing at length amid the Eternal Radiance.

But if there are implied in the fact of Christian education the practicalness of the intellectual life and the fearlessness of the religious life, so likewise is implied *the sacredness of all life*. The Church has theological seminaries, but she has colleges, too. Had she maintained nothing more than schools for the training of ministers, she would, by implication at least, have denied the sacred character of all other legitimate pursuits. Instead of following that narrow course, she has set herself to fit the youth of the land for effective work in every righteous department of endeavor. A glance through an alumni register is suggestive of the breadth of life followed by graduates, and therefore of the breadth of life vitally influenced by our institutions. Men have not always seen and valued the implication here offered. If preparation for these wide fields of labor should proceed under the dominion of Christian ideals, then it follows that these fields themselves should be under that same august dominion. Ere we know it, the ideal folded in the fact of Christian education has led us out to an ample and generous view of life. Doubtless no one influence in the modern era has had such effect in erasing false lines of distinction between sacred and secular as has the college of the Church.

Let it be frankly allowed that the followers of Christ waited a goodly season ere they recognized the legitimacy of all types of real learning. Their first attitude toward many branches was that of hostility. Augustine declared that "the ignorant seize heaven," and the context will not permit us to construe the words as being simply a plea for spirituality as against a heartless intellectuality. Gregory the Great declared that he would blush to have the Scriptures "subjected to the rules of grammar." [Aleuin, West, p. 11.] If this iron ecclesiastic were living to-day his face would be constantly crimsoned. Tertullian became the arch-extremist. He called the "patriarchs of philosophy" the "patriarchs of heresy," and named them "hucksters of philosophy and rhetoric." The apostolic constitutions assert that the Book of Kings give history; Job, eloquence; Proverbs, wisdom; the Psalms, tuneful strains; Genesis, the doctrine of origins; the excellent law of the Lord God, the proper customs and observances; and that the Christian student need not go beyond these, but must "abstain scrupulously from all strange and devilish books." These judgments seem harsh and eramping. But we may well recall that they came after decades of bloody persecution, and that many so-called instructors of the arts in the later Roman Empire were men of utter vileness. The

studies had fallen into bad company and they bore the penalty of associating with evil teachers.

But since the nature of Christianity was expansive, it was not possible that this first attitude should survive. Augustine himself became the leader of the wider movement back to which we may trace the liberal disciplines of Christian education. In his later years he committed himself, and through his leadership committed the Church, to a sane and wholesome relation to general studies. In a fanciful parallel he says that, as the children of Israel carried from idolatrous Egypt ornaments of silver and gold to devote them to a better use, so should scholars carry out of the heathen classics all truths and cultures to be used in the higher services of the kingdom. If the great father of Western Christendom did not reach the final goal of breadth, he surely started the Church in a hopeful direction. He gathered his teaching into a free and assuring maxim: "Let every good and true Christian recognize that truth, wherever he may find it, belongs to his Lord." [De Christina Doctrina, II, cap. 17.] From that time onward the followers of Christ were to be the leaders of men in the advancement of the liberal arts. The seed sown by the hand of Augustine has grown into extended fields of knowledge. Hundreds of schools and millions of scholars have sighted the ideal of breadth. Thus has it come about that Christian education has recognized and promoted the conception that all legitimate life is sacred. The kingdom of God has the roomiest boundaries, and the King is to hold all learning and all service under the sway of his pierced hand.

Now, as the whole includes the parts, all this means that our colleges must take due note of the legitimacy and sacredness of the Christian ministry. The ignorant have sometimes supposed that every institution of learning under the government of the Church was devoted exclusively to the raising up of preachers and pastors. This mistake shows that all the world does not yet know how inclusive is the purpose of the Church. It may show also that in the past years these schools have held an important relation to the supplying of the ministry. It would be unfortunate if any one should think that DePauw University was intended only for this one purpose; it would be equally unfortunate if any one should rightly say that DePauw University did not somewhat answer this purpose. For the foreboding fact is that we are soon to face the problem of a depleted ministry unless strong centers of inspiration and preparation are maintained and enlarged. It is easy to be deceived by the

figures of attendance at our theological seminaries. There is an increase of students in these great institutions; but there is also a decrease of candidates for the ministry. A recent issue of one of our Church papers contained advertisements asking for twenty-eight young preachers. The technical professions and the commercial marts are making such dazzling offers that young men are not drawn to the life of sober toil and meager salary. There are still other influences which make the problem complex. We need name but one. There can be no debating the fact that in recent years the ministry has lost something of its special claim. It was inevitable that this loss should occur when men came to the idea that every legitimate pursuit was sacred. If we are to accept the thought that all men should be equally the servants of God, that the layman is called to a consecration as deep and dear and holy as that which commands the preacher, it is very plain that the ministerial profession has lost its lonely character.

This is not the season for any discussion of the nature of the call to preach. We press the point no farther than to say that if we teach men that all legitimate work should belong to God, we certainly teach that there is more than one form of "sacred ministry." The man who enters the ministry because he feels that it is the only way of giving all of life to God is a heretic at the outset. The Christian college, with its graduates distributed in scores of occupations, is a protest against any such practical heterodoxy. The Church has consecrated its gold to the schools because it believed that youth should have a Christian training for all legitimate forms of employment. The breadth of that conception deserves grateful emphasis. But from this view-point we may see how the ministry can gain a new glory. What a privilege to teach men that all life is to belong to the Lord; that all honest endeavor is sacred; that there is a way in which ideals can be brought back; that the sin which soils so much of legitimate work and fathers all illegitimate work may be forgiven and defeated forever! When our young men understand the sovereign charm and the infinite reach of the ministerial pursuit, our brightest and best will come to it with an eager and glad consecration.

Meantime, our Christian colleges are the great hopes against a disastrous depletion. Say what we may as to the complete equipment and splendid work of our State institutions, the sure fact is that they are not turning their graduates toward the ministry of the Church. In the five years just preceding, three hundred young

men have matriculated at the Boston University School of Theology. Of the three hundred, eleven came from State schools. This means that the Ohio Wesleyan University alone has sent more men to this theological seminary in the last five years than all the combined State schools of our Nation. Analyze and explain the figures as we may, we are driven to this judgment: The hope for a well-equipped ministry lies in the Church schools of our Nation. If that were all, the function of institutions like our own would still be important. But that is not all. This Christian college is consecrated to breadth of life. It prepares its sons and daughters for every form of usefulness. It is neither monastery nor nunnery; its novitiates are dedicated to all types of human service. It believes that every truth, when properly understood and interpreted, may be pressed into the service of the kingdom. In its ideal it is the academy of humanity, the vestibule of the whole temple of life, the school of all sciences, the apprenticeship of all occupations, the training-ground for all soldiers of the King.

These, then, are the meanings of Christian education. We tarry with the theme only long enough to connect it with this day and its great cause. It is not hard to find the working of these ideals in the history of DePauw University. This institution has sustained a practical relation to the life of our world. It has never advocated or cultivated a sequestered and cloistered culture. Its alumni have been marked by a singular spirit of energy. In Senate or House, in pulpit or market, on farm and in city, in school room and office, her children have faced the practical problems with stern resolution and with winning earnestness. And for two generations this university has stood for the fearlessness of faith. She has not welcomed theories simply because they were new nor harbored them merely because they were old. The world has never accused her of interfering with the pure freedom of instruction. Her trustees and teachers have not been afraid that the opening of the doors of knowledge meant the closing of the doors of trust. With an admirable balance of conservatism and progressiveness, she has moved through the years of changing opinion with the full conviction that everything which says, "I am a truth," is the property of Him who said, "I am the Truth." Likewise has the institution stood for the sacredness of all legitimate life. The representatives of her Christian spirit are in all vocations. The children of this "cherishing mother" walk the good paths everywhere. They are in the ministry, as men call it in formal phrase; but they are in the wider min-

istry of honest work, unsullied character, flashing ideals, and countless services. When these three tremendous items that represent the spiritual returns upon our investments here are listed on the ledger, all expense of time, thought, toil, and wealth are overbalanced, and the Christian investor feels that he is receiving stupendous dividends. DePauw University fronts the future determined to be evermore an exponent and exemplar of the practicalness of the intellectual life, the fearlessness of the religious life, and the sacredness of all legitimate life. God bless the dear old university, and keep her true to this wonderful mission! To you, Mr. Chairman, and to your fellow-trustees, jealous and generous guardians of this vast educational trust; to you, members of the university faculties, partners in long devotion to our work; to you, students of DePauw, resting under the thrill of youth and of this day's emotion, and to your successors of the years to be; to you, fathers and mothers, representing the dearest anxieties and ambitions of thousands of homes; to you, Christian pastors and laymen, by whose co-operative spirit this institution stands in strength to-day; to you, O State of Indiana, rich in history and richer still in hope; but most to thee, O blessed Christ, I pledge an inadequate life that within these walls the sons and daughters of our Church and commonwealth shall be trained to face life's realities practically, to face life's doubts fearlessly, to face life's legitimate labor sacredly!

We hear the march of the thousands of students who, in coming days, shall approach these halls. We see the smaller, but statelier procession of those who go out with the seal of graduation upon them and with their lives set to higher music. For the university and for her children we offer the prayer:

“In and out let the young life as steadily flow,
As in broad Narragansett the tides come and go;
And its sons and its daughters in prairie and town
Remember its honor and guard its renown.

“Not vainly the gift of its founders was made;
Not prayerless the stones of its corner were laid;
The blessing of Him whom in secret they sought
Has owned the good work which the fathers have wrought.

“To Him be the glory forever! We bear
To the Lord of the Harvest our wheat with the tare;
What we lack in our work may He find in our will,
And winnow in mercy our good from the ill.”*

*Whittier's Poems, pp. 312, 313.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 110181168